



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,772	08/06/2001	Max Henrion	019518-002010US	9387

20350 7590 05/07/2003

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/923,772

Applicant(s)

HENRION ET AL.

Examiner

Neveen Abel-Jalil

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fratkina et al. (U.S. Pub. 2001/0049688).

As to claim 1, Fratkina et al. discloses a method for assisting a user in selecting one or more items from an item set that best match a set of target preferences (See page 13, column 2, lines 33-48), the method comprising:

obtaining information from the user about that user's set of target preferences, using direct questions (See page 13, column 2, lines 33-48);

generating at least one list of items selected from the item set that will best meet the set of target preferences based on the information provided (See page 20, column 1, lines 55-67, wherein "target preference" reads on "possible answers or highly relevant information to the user"); and

generating a display including the list of items and explanations for at least one item on the list of items explaining how well attributes of the at least one item match the set of target preferences (See page 8, column 2, lines 14-67, wherein "explanation" reads on "short synopsis",

Art Unit: 2175

and wherein "preferences" reads on "attributes", and wherein "display" reads on "dialog", also see page 11, column 1, lines 20-34, wherein "list" reads on "ranking").

As to claim 2, Fratkina et al. discloses wherein the item is a product, service or other selectable element (See page 1, column 2, lines 25-32, also see page 1, column 1, prior art, lines 32-57).

As to claim 3, Fratkina et al. discloses wherein the information obtained from questions to the user is supplemented with other information about the user (See page 1, column 2, lines 34-49).

As to claim 6, Fratkina et al. discloses further comprising a step of providing the user with explanations of recommendations (See page 8, column 2, lines 14-31, wherein "explanation" reads on "short synopsis"), where each explanation contains at least one pro or at least one con, and the explanation refers to an attribute of the item and identifies how well the attribute meets the user's set of target preferences (See page 8, column 1, lines 32-51, wherein "how well the attribute" reads on "indicated the knowledge container's strength of association", and wherein "user's set of target preferences" reads on "tag created by a person").

As to claims 7, and 14, Fratkina et al. discloses wherein one or more pro or con includes a reference to the set of target preferences (See page 13, column 2, lines 51-67, and page 14,

Art Unit: 2175

column 1, lines 1-25, wherein “pro” reads on “positive”, and wherein “con” reads on “negative”).

As to claim 8, Fratkina et al. discloses further comprising generating a statement relating one or more pro or con to a matching of an attribute and a recommendation for or against an item based on indirect inferences from user inputs (See page 14, column 2, lines 25-40, wherein “indirect” reads on “learned from interacting with the customer”, also see page 18, column 2, lines 57-67, also page 19, column 1, lines 65-67, and page 19, column 2, lines 1-25).

As to claim 9, Fratkina et al. discloses wherein each explanation includes those pros and cons that have high estimated decision relevance to the user, and excludes at least one mention of a low estimated relevance attribute (See page 19, column 2, lines 26-56, wherein “excludes” reads on previous printer information is no longer relevant”).

As to claim 11, Fratkina et al. discloses further comprising generating for display to the user a list of common attributes (See page 19, column 2, lines 41-56, wherein “attributes” reads on “parameters”) for which all of the items on the list of items have common values (See page 8, lines column 2, lines 29-31, wherein “common” reads on “subset”, also see page 14, column 1, lines 63-67, and page 14, column 2, lines 1-9, wherein “list” reads on “ranking”).

Art Unit: 2175

As to claim 12, Fratkina et al. discloses wherein the list of common attributes includes attributes that have values in a common range (See page 19, column 2, lines 12-14, also see page 19, column 2, lines 47-56, wherein “attributes” reads on “parameter”).

As to claim 13, Fratkina et al. discloses wherein the list of common attributes includes pros and cons for attributes that have high estimated importance to the user and excludes at least one pro or con for at least one attribute that has a low estimated importance to the user (See page 18, column 1, lines 20-42, also see page 23, column 1, lines 28-45).

As to claim 15, Fratkina et al. discloses further comprising generating a statement relating one or more pro or con to a matching of an attribute and a recommendation for or against an item based on indirect inferences from user inputs (See page 15, column 1, lines 36-60, wherein “user inputs” reads on “user selections on the screen”, wherein “pro” reads on “relevance ... confirmed”, and wherein “con” reads on “irrelevant or rejected”).

As to claim 16, Fratkina et al. discloses further comprising offering questions to the user in a sequence that is determined dynamically based on answers to previous questions (See page 15, column 2, lines 40-67, also see page 19, column 1, lines 49-67).

As to claim 20, Fratkina et al. discloses wherein if no item meets all requirements specified by the user (See page 14, column 2, lines 1-23), the system displays a conflict page that

mentions the fact that no items meet all requirements and lists the requirements that cannot be simultaneously met (See page 4, column 2, lines 32-57, also see page 19, column 1, lines 49-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fratkina et al. (U.S. Pub. 2001/0049688) in view of Busey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,944).

As to claim 4, Fratkina et al. discloses wherein the other information includes one or more of information provided by the user during online interactions (See page 2, column 2, lines 41-48).

Fratkina et al. does not disclose information provided by the user during offline interactions.

Busey et al. discloses information provided by the user during offline interactions (See column 10, lines 23-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Fratkina et al. to include information provided by the user during offline interactions.

Art Unit: 2175

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Fratkina et al. by the teaching of Busey et al. to include information provided by the user during offline interactions because it provides for accurate data collection and tracking of customer's profile and preference leading to efficient database operation and storage.

As to claim 5, Fratkina et al. as modified discloses wherein the information provided by the user is one or more of registration information, information about prior selections, information about prior purchases and information about prior interactions with automated decision advisors (See page 17, column 1, lines 13-28, also see page 18, column 2, lines 57-67, and page 19, column 1, lines 1-3, also see page 9, column 1, lines 55-61).

5. Claims 10, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fratkina et al. (U.S. Pub. 2001/0049688) in view of Marchisio (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,406).

As to claim 10, Fratkina et al. does not disclose further comprising:
a step of estimating decision relevance of an attribute to the user as an increasing function of estimated importance of the attribute to the user and an absolute relative preference value,
wherein the absolute relative preference value of a given item is a measure of a difference between an attribute value for the given item and an average value of the attribute for items in the list of items other than the given item.

Marchisio discloses further comprising:

Art Unit: 2175

a step of estimating decision relevance of an attribute to the user as an increasing function of estimated importance of the attribute to the user and an absolute relative preference value (See column 17, lines 47-67, also see column 2, lines 3-43),

wherein the absolute relative preference value of a given item is a measure of a difference between an attribute value for the given item and an average value of the attribute for items in the list of items other than the given item (See column 7, lines 40-65, and column 8, lines 1-19, wherein "difference" reads on "lambda", also see column 9, lines 52-67, wherein "average" reads on "weighting", and wherein "list" reads on "matrix").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Fratkina et al. to include further comprising:

a step of estimating decision relevance of an attribute to the user as an increasing function of estimated importance of the attribute to the user and an absolute relative preference value,

wherein the absolute relative preference value of a given item is a measure of a difference between an attribute value for the given item and an average value of the attribute for items in the list of items other than the given item.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Fratkina et al. by the teaching of Marchisio to include further comprising:

a step of estimating decision relevance of an attribute to the user as an increasing function of estimated importance of the attribute to the user and an absolute relative preference value,

wherein the absolute relative preference value of a given item is a measure of a difference between an attribute value for the given item and an average value of the attribute for items in

Art Unit: 2175

the list of items other than the given item because statistical analysis of "target matching" allows for efficient database storage and retrieval providing the users with accurate results.

As to claim 17, Fratkina et al. does not disclose wherein sequence of questions, is based on a priority calculated as an increasing function of the uncertainty about the importance of the attributes to which the question pertains and the variation in attribute values among the items.

Marchisio discloses wherein sequence of questions, is based on a priority calculated as an increasing function of the uncertainty about the importance of the attributes to which the question pertains and the variation in attribute values among the items (See column 7, lines 28-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Fratkina et al. to include wherein sequence of questions, is based on a priority calculated as an increasing function of the uncertainty about the importance of the attributes to which the question pertains and the variation in attribute values among the items.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Fratkina et al. by the teaching of Marchisio to include wherein sequence of questions, is based on a priority calculated as an increasing function of the uncertainty about the importance of the attributes to which the question pertains and the variation in attribute values among the items because calculating uncertainly and ranking results based on priority provides for faster processing time in database query and retrieval.

As to claim 18, Fratkina et al. as modified discloses wherein the variation of attribute value among the items is weighted to the values of the items with the high current ranking (See page 23, column 1, lines 1-24) so that the question priority reflects the expectation that answers to the question are likely to change the ranking of the top ranked items (See page 14, column 1, lines 63-67, and see page 14, column 2, lines 1-9).

As to claim 19, Fratkina et al. as modified discloses wherein the system mentions for each unmet requirements and selected combinations of requirements the number of items it or they eliminate as unacceptable (See page 10, column 1, lines 23-37, also see page 21, column 2, lines 1-17).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Pant et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,053) discloses user control relevance ranking of search results.

Dunning et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0082901) discloses relationship discovery engine.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 703-305-8114. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4:30PM.

Art Unit: 2175

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Neveen Abel-Jalil
May 5, 2003

Charles Rones

**CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER**